

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT OF  
HARRY ELMER WILLIAMS AND  
TAMARA WILLIAMS, REGISTERED  
OWNERS of the 1988 53-foot Hyundai  
Elegante MK V, HIN: HTG49015B888,  
Official Number: 937193, named "OCEAN  
VENTURES," her engines, tackle, apparel,  
etc. in a cause of Exoneration From or  
Limitation of Liability

) Case No. 11cv00984-BTM (WMc)  
)  
)  
) **ORDER CONTINUING MANDATORY  
SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE**

On November 2, 2012, the parties filed a joint motion to continue the the Mandatory Settlement Conference (“MSC”) set for *November 5, 2012 at 9:15 a.m.* in the chambers of Judge William McCurine, Jr. After reviewing the motion, the Court finds good cause to GRANT the parties’ request. Accordingly, the MSC is CONTINUED to ***January 4, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.*** Counsel shall submit simultaneous, confidential settlement briefs directly to chambers. Counsel shall submit their briefs no later than *noon on December 19, 2012*. The briefs shall set forth the party’s statement of the case and the party’s settlement position, including the last offer or demand made by that party and a separate statement of the offer or demand the party is prepared to make at the MSC. MSC briefs shall not exceed ten (10) pages in length, and shall not include exhibits or attachments. *All parties and claims adjusters for insured defendants and representatives with complete authority to enter into a binding settlement*, as well as the principal attorney (s) responsible for the litigation,

1 must be present and legally and factually prepared to discuss and resolve the case at the MSC. “Full  
2 authority to settle” means that the individuals at the settlement conference must be authorized to  
3 fully explore settlement options and to agree at that time to any settlement terms acceptable to the  
4 parties. Heileman Brewing Co., Inc. v. Joseph Oat Corp., 871 F.2d 648 (7th Cir. 1989). The person  
5 needs to have “unfettered discretion and authority” to change the settlement position of a party.  
6 Pitman v. Brinker Intl., Inc., 216 F.R.D. 481, 485-486 (D. Ariz. 2003). The purpose of requiring a  
7 person with unlimited settlement authority to attend the conference includes that the person’s view  
8 of the case may be altered during the face to face conference. Id. at 486. A limited or a sum certain  
9 of authority is not adequate. Nick v. Morgan’s Foods, Inc., 270 F.3d 590 (8th Cir. 2001). Any  
10 special arrangements desired in cases where settlement authority rests with a governing body shall  
11 be proposed in advance.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 DATED: November 8, 2012

14  
15   
16

17 Hon. William McCurine, Jr.  
U.S. Magistrate Judge  
United States District Court

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28